

§ 13.5.3 If such procedures for testing, inspection or approval under Sections 13.5.1 and 13.5.2 reveal failure of the portions of the Work to comply with requirements established by the Contract Documents, all costs made necessary by such failure including those of repeated procedures and compensation for the Architect's services and expenses shall be at the Contractor's expense.

§ 13.5.4 Required certificates of testing, inspection or approval shall, unless otherwise required by the Contract Documents, be secured by the Contractor and promptly delivered to the Architect.

§ 13.5.5 If the Architect is to observe tests, inspections or approvals required by the Contract Documents, the Architect will do so promptly and, where practicable, at the normal place of testing.

§ 13.5.6 Tests or inspections conducted pursuant to the Contract Documents shall be made promptly to avoid unreasonable delay in the Work.

§ 13.6 INTEREST

§ 13.6.1 Payments due and unpaid under the Contract Documents shall bear interest from the date payment is due at such rate as the parties may agree upon in writing or, in the absence thereof, at the legal rate prevailing from time to time at the place where the Project is located.

§ 13.7 COMMENCEMENT OF STATUTORY LIMITATION PERIOD

§ 13.7.1 As between the Owner and Contractor:

1. Before Substantial Completion. As to acts or failures to act occurring prior to the relevant date of Substantial Completion, any applicable statute of limitations shall commence to run and any alleged cause of action shall be deemed to have accrued in any and all events not later than such date of Substantial Completion;
2. Between Substantial Completion and Final Certificate for Payment. As to acts or failures to act occurring subsequent to the relevant date of Substantial Completion and prior to issuance of the final Certificate for Payment, any applicable statute of limitations shall commence to run and any alleged cause of action shall be deemed to have accrued in any and all events not later than the date of issuance of the final Certificate for Payment; and
3. After Final Certificate for Payment. As to acts or failures to act occurring after the relevant date of issuance of the final Certificate for Payment, any applicable statute of limitations shall commence to run and any alleged cause of action shall be deemed to have accrued in any and all events not later than the date of any act or failure to act by the Contractor pursuant to any Warranty provided under Section 3.5, the date of any correction of the Work or failure to correct the Work by the Contractor under Section 12.2, or the date of actual commission of any other act or failure to perform any duty or obligation by the Contractor or Owner, whichever occurs last.

ARTICLE 14. TERMINATION OR SUSPENSION OF THE CONTRACT

§ 14.1 TERMINATION BY THE CONTRACTOR

§ 14.1.1 The Contractor may terminate the Contract if the Work is stopped for a period of 30 consecutive days through no act or fault of the Contractor or a Subcontractor, Sub-subcontractor or their agents or employees or any other persons or entities performing portions of the Work under direct or indirect contract with the Contractor, for any of the following reasons:

1. issuance of an order of a court or other public authority having jurisdiction which requires all Work to be stopped;
2. an act of government, such as a declaration of national emergency which requires all Work to be stopped;
3. because the Architect has not issued a Certificate for Payment and has not notified the Contractor of the reason for withholding certification as provided in Section 9.4.1, or because the Owner has not made payment on a Certificate for Payment within the time stated in the Contract Documents; or
4. the Owner has failed to furnish to the Contractor promptly, upon the Contractor's request, reasonable evidence as required by Section 2.2.1.

§ 14.1.2 The Contractor may terminate the Contract if, through no act or fault of the Contractor or a Subcontractor, Sub-subcontractor or their agents or employees or any other persons or entities performing portions of the Work under direct or indirect contract with the Contractor, repeated suspensions, delays or interruptions of the entire Work

init.

AIA Document A201™ 1997. Copyright © 1911, 1915, 1918, 1925, 1937, 1951, 1958, 1961, 1963, 1966, 1970, 1976, 1987 and 1997 by The American Institute of Architects. All rights reserved. WARNING: This AIA Document is protected by U.S. Copyright Law and International Treaties. Unauthorized reproduction or distribution of this AIA Document, or any portion of it, may result in severe civil and criminal penalties, and will be prosecuted to the maximum extent possible under the law. This document was produced by AIA software at 13:26:35 on 09/24/2008 under Order No. 1000356699, which expires on 5/16/2009, and is not for resale. (2404291990)

by the Owner as described in Section 14.3 constitute in the aggregate more than 100 percent of the total number of days scheduled for completion, or 120 days in any 365-day period, whichever is less.

§ 14.1.3 If one of the reasons described in Section 14.1.1 or 14.1.2 exists, the Contractor may, upon seven days' written notice to the Owner and Architect, terminate the Contract and recover from the Owner payment for Work executed and for proven loss with respect to materials, equipment, tools, and construction equipment and machinery, including reasonable overhead, profit and damages.

§ 14.1.4 If the Work is stopped for a period of 60 consecutive days through no act or fault of the Contractor or a Subcontractor or their agents or employees or any other persons performing portions of the Work under contract with the Contractor because the Owner has persistently failed to fulfill the Owner's obligations under the Contract Documents with respect to matters important to the progress of the Work, the Contractor may, upon seven additional days' written notice to the Owner and the Architect, terminate the Contract and recover from the Owner as provided in Section 14.1.3.

§ 14.2 TERMINATION BY THE OWNER FOR CAUSE

§ 14.2.1 The Owner may terminate the Contract if the Contractor:

1. persistently or repeatedly refuses or fails to supply enough properly skilled workers or proper materials;
2. fails to make payment to Subcontractors for materials or labor in accordance with the respective agreements between the Contractor and the Subcontractors;
3. persistently disregards laws, ordinances, or rules, regulations or orders of a public authority having jurisdiction; or
4. otherwise is guilty of substantial breach of a provision of the Contract Documents.

§ 14.2.2 When any of the above reasons exist, the Owner, upon certification by the Architect that sufficient cause exists to justify such action, may without prejudice to any other rights or remedies of the Owner and after giving the Contractor and the Contractor's surety, if any, seven days' written notice, terminate employment of the Contractor and may, subject to any prior rights of the surety:

1. take possession of the site and of all materials, equipment, tools, and construction equipment and machinery thereon owned by the Contractor;
2. accept assignment of subcontracts pursuant to Section 5.4; and
3. finish the Work by whatever reasonable method the Owner may deem expedient. Upon request of the Contractor, the Owner shall furnish to the Contractor a detailed accounting of the costs incurred by the Owner in finishing the Work.

§ 14.2.3 When the Owner terminates the Contract for one of the reasons stated in Section 14.2.1, the Contractor shall not be entitled to receive further payment until the Work is finished.

§ 14.2.4 If the unpaid balance of the Contract Sum exceeds costs of finishing the Work, including compensation for the Architect's services and expenses made necessary thereby, and other damages incurred by the Owner and not expressly waived, such excess shall be paid to the Contractor. If such costs and damages exceed the unpaid balance, the Contractor shall pay the difference to the Owner. The amount to be paid to the Contractor or Owner, as the case may be, shall be certified by the Architect, upon application, and this obligation for payment shall survive termination of the Contract.

§ 14.3 SUSPENSION BY THE OWNER FOR CONVENIENCE

§ 14.3.1 The Owner may, without cause, order the Contractor in writing to suspend, delay or interrupt the Work in whole or in part for such period of time as the Owner may determine.

§ 14.3.2 The Contract Sum and Contract Time shall be adjusted for increases in the cost and time caused by suspension, delay or interruption as described in Section 14.3.1. Adjustment of the Contract Sum shall include profit. No adjustment shall be made to the extent:

1. that performance is, was or would have been so suspended, delayed or interrupted by another cause for which the Contractor is responsible; or
2. that an equitable adjustment is made or denied under another provision of the Contract.

AIA Document A201™ - 1997. Copyright © 1911, 1915, 1918, 1925, 1937, 1951, 1958, 1961, 1963, 1966, 1970, 1976, 1987 and 1997 by The American Institute of Architects. All rights reserved. WARNING: This AIA Document is protected by U.S. Copyright Law and International Treaties. Unauthorized reproduction or distribution of this AIA Document, or any portion of it, may result in severe civil and criminal penalties, and will be prosecuted to the maximum extent possible under the law. This document was produced by AIA software at 13:26:35 on 09/24/2008 under Order No. 1000356899, 1 which expires on 5/16/2009, and is not for resale. User Notes: (2404291930)

§ 14.4 TERMINATION BY THE OWNER FOR CONVENIENCE

§ 14.4.1 The Owner may, at any time, terminate the Contract for the Owner's convenience and without cause.

§ 14.4.2 Upon receipt of written notice from the Owner of such termination for the Owner's convenience, the Contractor shall:

1. cease operations as directed by the Owner in the notice;
2. take actions necessary, or that the Owner may direct, for the protection and preservation of the Work; and
3. except for Work directed to be performed prior to the effective date of termination stated in the notice, terminate all existing subcontracts and purchase orders and enter into no further subcontracts and purchase orders.

§ 14.4.3 In case of such termination for the Owner's convenience, the Contractor shall be entitled to receive payment for Work executed, and costs incurred by reason of such termination, along with reasonable overhead and profit on the Work not executed.

Additions and Deletions Report for AIA Document A201™ - 1997

This Additions and Deletions Report, as defined on page 1 of the associated document, reproduces below all text the author has added to the standard form AIA document in order to complete it, as well as any text the author may have added to or deleted from the original AIA text. Added text is shown underlined. Deleted text is indicated with a horizontal line through the original AIA text.

Note: This Additions and Deletions Report is provided for information purposes only and is not incorporated into or constitute any part of the associated AIA document. This Additions and Deletions Report and its associated document were generated simultaneously by AIA software at 13:26:35 on 09/24/2008.

PAGE 1

American University of Antigua
College of Medicine

(Name and address):
AUA College of Medicine
c/o Greater Caribbean Learning Center
New York, NY 10005

(Name and address):
Sundaram Architects PVT. Ltd.
No. 19 Kumara Krupa Road.
Bangalore 560-001
India

PAGE 21

§ 4.6.2 Claims not resolved by mediation shall be decided by arbitration which, unless the parties mutually agree otherwise, shall be in accordance with the Construction Industry Arbitration Rules of the American Arbitration Association currently in effect. The demand for arbitration shall be filed in writing with the other party to the Contract and with the American Arbitration Association, and a copy shall be filed with the Architect. Location of any Arbitration will be Antigua.

Additions and Deletions Report for AIA Document A201™ - 1997. Copyright © 1917, 1918, 1925, 1937, 1951, 1958, 1961, 1963, 1966, 1970, 1976, 1987 and 1997 by The American Institute of Architects. All rights reserved. WARNING: This AIA® Document is protected by U.S. Copyright Law and International Treaties. Unauthorized reproduction or distribution of this AIA® Document, or any portion of it, may result in severe civil and criminal penalties, and will be prosecuted to the maximum extent possible under the law. This document was produced by AIA software at 13:26:35 on 09/24/2008 under Order No. 1000356699_1 which expires on 5/16/2009, and is not for resale.

User Notes:

(2404291990)

AUA-000055

EXHIBIT B

**INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION
AMERICAN ARBITRATION ASSOCIATION**

LEEWARD CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, LTD., Claimant, vs. AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF ANTIGUA – COLLEGE OF MEDICINE, Respondent.	Case No.: 50 110 T 00075 11
--	------------------------------------

FINAL AWARD

We, THE UNDERSIGNED ARBITRATORS, having been designated in accordance with the Arbitration Agreement entered into between the above named parties and dated September 25, 2008, and having been duly sworn, and having duly heard the proofs and allegations of the Parties, and the parties having agreed that the Arbitrators need to render a reasoned award, do hereby, AWARD, as follows:

I. BRIEF PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND:

The present case was brought on February 3, 2011 by Leeward Construction Company, LTD. ("Leeward") against American University of Antigua - College of Medicine ("AUA"), claiming the amount of EC \$13,161,137¹ from a dispute that arose out of the construction of a medical school in St. Johns, Antigua. Leeward claimed that AUA breached their contract and sought remedies under § 4.6 of the Contract, henceforth, demanded arbitration for the disputes set forth in their claim.

AUA filed a response on March 4, 2011, stating that Leeward's claim was so vague, confusing and contradictory that AUA was not in the position to understand the basis for the claims.

The Panel was selected and sworn on July 6th, 2011, comprised by Attorneys José R. Capó, Jorge R. Jiménez and Professional Engineer Héctor M. Varela. Attorney Jiménez was designated Chair of the Panel.

On October 14, 2011, Leeward filed an Amended Demand for Arbitration seeking EC \$6,800,572.28 in damages. AUA filed its Answering Statement and Counterclaim on November 30, 2011.

¹ Whenever reference is made to a monetary sum, same shall be understood to be represented in Eastern Caribbean (EC) dollars, unless otherwise stated.

On December 12, 2011, Leeward filed a Statement objecting AUA's claims for liquidated damages and delay damages, arguing that such claims have been presented untimely. On December 23, 2011, AUA's filed a Statement in opposition to the motion presented by Leeward to dismiss AUA's counterclaims, asserting the timeliness of its claims.

Afterwards both parties commenced discovery proceedings and filed numerous motions including dispositive motions, the resolution of which the Panel held in abeyance until the holding of the Hearings to be decided as part of the Final Award. We will discuss same in detail in *Section III* of this Award. The Hearings were held in the Marriott Courtyard in Isla Verde, Puerto Rico, from March 5th through March 9th 2012. On April 11, 2012, AUA withdrew from its Answering Statement and Counterclaim the portion that sought actual damages and left only those claims for liquidated damages in the amount of US \$117,000.00 and for attorneys' fees and expenses. As per their request, the parties submitted their Proposed Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law on April 20, 2012. The parties also submitted rebuttal briefs on May 4th, 2012.

The Panel declared the hearings closed and the case submitted for resolution on May 22, 2012.

This case was administered under the AAA Construction Industry Arbitration Rules ("CIAR") as amended and in effect October 1, 2009.

II. UNCONTESTED FACTS:

1. Leeward is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Antigua and Barbuda, with office and principal place of business at All Saints Road, St. Johns, Antigua.
2. AUA is owned by the GCLR, LLC, a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York, with office and principal place of business at 1 Battery Park Plaza, 33rd Floor, New York, New York, U.S.A.
3. In the Spring of 2008, AUA and Leeward began to negotiate the terms of a contract to construct the structural works portion of the AUA's new medical school campus in Antigua.
4. AUA and Leeward entered into a Letter of Intent on or about April 21, 2008 which was signed by Neal Simon, President of AUA, and Andy Green, Managing Director of Leeward. A copy of the April 21, 2008 Letter of Intent was marked as LC 69.
5. AUA and Leeward entered into a second Letter of Intent on or about May 10, 2008, which was signed by Corey Greenberg, Chief Operating Officer of AUA, and Andy Green, Managing Director of Leeward. A copy of the May 10, 2008 Letter of Intent was marked as LC 70.
6. On September 25, 2008, Leeward (as contractor) and AUA (as project owner) executed a contract for the construction of the College of Medicine in St. John's

Antigua for the fixed price of EC \$27,436,824.00, subject to additions and deductions as provided in the Contract Documents, under the AIA Contract Document (A101-1997).

7. The parties agreed that the commencement date for the works was May 1, 2008.

8. Leeward had to achieve substantial completion of the entire work in 364 calendar days or as follows:

Portion of the work	Substantial Completion Date
Classroom block	29/01/2009
Lab Block	06/03/2009
Service Block	29/01/2009
Library and Admin. Block	30/04/2009

9. Lt. Colonel Roche Antony was AUA's representative for the project and signed the Contract Documents on AUA's behalf.

10. Neil Dickinson was Leeward's Project Manager for the project and signed the Contract Documents on Leeward's behalf.

11. Sundaram Architects Pvt. Ltd. ("SAPL" or the Architect) was the architect that designed AUA's new Medical School Campus. A.S. Nagesh served as the Architect's representative.

12. Leeward and AUA also entered into a number of Separate Contracts, including a contract to install the doors and windows dated July 13, 2009 (marked as LC 228) and a contract of laying floor tiles dated July 13, 2009 (marked as LC 229).

13. On February 3, 2011, Leeward filed a Demand for Arbitration seeking EC\$13,161,137.00 in damages.

14. On October 14, 2011, Leeward filed an Amended Demand for Arbitration seeking EC\$6,800,572.28 in damages.

III. TRIAL EXHIBITS:

A) Leeward's Trial Exhibits

Exhibit list 1-245 as amended by the Joint Post-Hearing Motion, dated April 12, 2012.

B) AUA's Trial Exhibits

Exhibit list 1-71 as amended by the Joint Post-Hearing Motion, dated April 12, 2012.

IV. WITNESSES:

A) Leeward's Witnesses

1. Robert Winwood-Senior Quantity Surveyor for Leeward, from Sept. 1, 2008-August 14, 2009. He was responsible for administration and surveying of the work with respect to the Construction of the AUA Project.
2. Eric Linde-Director of Leeward. Over 45 years of hands on experience in the Construction Industry in Antigua and US.
3. Neil Dickinson-Projects Director for Leeward from March 1, 2007 to Feb. 17, 2009, then managing director until Oct. 9, 2009, and was responsible for contract negotiations and administration of the works with respect to the Construction of the AUA Project.
4. Andy Green-Managing Director of Leeward.

B) AUA's Witnesses

1. Prabhu Marudheri-Executive Director of Finance for GCLE, LLC, an agent for AUA.
2. Peter McLeod-Partner with DHP Associates, a firm of Chartered Quantity Surveyors and Project Managers located in the Bahamas.
3. A.S.Nagesh-Architects' representative.
4. Lt. Col. Roche Antony-General Manager on behalf of AUA, for the project.

V. INTERLOCUTORY MATTERS:

1. Controversy:

Leeward's request to strike the testimony of AUA's witness Peter McLeod based on the fact that same is expert testimony, which AUA had represented it would not be using. The Panel must decide if said testimony is factual or expert testimony.

Panel's Decision:

Refer to the Panel's Decision in section VI. (A-25).

2. Controversy:

AUA's motion requesting dismissal of Leeward's claims for amounts unpaid or due under the contracts for additional work. The Panel must decide if: (1) Leeward's claim for unpaid

balances and monies owed for additional works was included in the Amended Demand for Arbitration, henceforth, providing AUA with due process; and (2) if the parties submitted to arbitration said claims in this proceeding.

Panel's Decision:

After reviewing both parties' arguments and careful analysis of the questions posed, this Panel finds that all claims arising from the Separate Contracts are not subject to this Arbitration. We find in favor of AUA and conclude that the arbitration clause that both parties agreed to, only reached claims arising out of or relating to the original Contract. Nothing in the Separate Contracts evidence intent from the parties to subject same to arbitration, nor does the record show that AUA agreed to arbitrate disputes under the Separate Contracts.

3. Controversy:

AUA's motion requesting that Leeward's claims be dismissed for untimely filing. This Panel must decide if dismissal is appropriate against Leeward, because Leeward's claim for final payment was initiated in violation of the 21 day notice requirement, and because Leeward's 16-20 month delay in commencing arbitration was unreasonable.

Panel's Decision:

After due analysis, this Panel denies AUA's motion requesting that Leeward's claims be dismissed for untimely filing.

4. Controversy:

Leeward's motion requesting that AUA's counterclaim be dismissed for untimely filing. This Panel must determine if AUA filed the counterclaim within the time period stated under Section R-4(c)(ii) of the AAA's CIAR.

Panel's Decision:

After due analysis, this Panel denies Leeward's motion requesting that AUA's counterclaim be dismissed for untimely filing.

VI. CONTROVERSIES SUBMITTED TO THE PANEL FOR RESOLUTION:

A. Claimant's (Leeward's) controversies submitted to arbitration:

1. Controversy:

Whether the Contract is a fixed price contract subject to additions or deletions by change order or whether the Contract price is based upon measured works?

Panel's Decision:

The Panel rules that the Contract is a fixed price contract subject to additions and deletions. Leeward is entitled to receive compensation for work performed. Even though the Contract provides that additions and deletions should be made by formal change orders, from the evidence considered by the Panel it appears that both parties waived this requirement.

2. Controversy:

Whether AUA breached the Contract with respect to the issuance of change orders, certificates of substantial completion, certificate of final completion, the review, certification, and payment of payment requisitions, the determination of claims, and the administration of the Contract?

Panel's Decision:

This Panel finds that both parties failed in their contractual responsibility to follow and enforce the General Conditions of the Contract AIA 201-1997. The respective liability of each party with respect to certain claims will be addressed in this Final Award.

3. Controversy:

Whether AUA breached the Contract by failing to timely pay the amount due on payment requisitions?

Panel's Decision:

This Panel finds that AUA did breach the Contract on this matter. In many instances AUA had concerns regarding the quantities invoiced, however, there were reasonable alternatives in case the parties did not reach an agreement to issue the partial payments, as stated in Article 9.5.1 of the Contract. This Panel rules that holding the entire amount was far from reasonable and fair.

4. Controversy:

If AUA breached the Contract by failing to timely pay the amount due on payment requisitions, is Leeward entitled to interest on the late payments at the legal rate under the laws of Antigua and if so, whether 10% per annum is the proper rate?

Panel's Decision:

This Panel finds that Leeward is entitled to interest on the payments due and unpaid as set forth under sections 7.2 and 13.6.1 of the Contract and General Conditions. However, this Panel agrees with AUA in that the interest agreed upon by the parties was the "legal rate" and therefore interest shall be calculated at 7% per annum.

5. Controversy:

If the Contract was for a fixed price, is Leeward entitled to payment for work that AUA omitted, deleted or modified from the Contract's original scope of work?

Panel's Decision:

No. Leeward is only entitled to payment for work performed. However, this Panel finds that Leeward is entitled to damages in the amount of EC \$ 232,670.13 for work that was deleted.

from the Contract and then assigned to Leeward under Separate Contracts, under the bad faith doctrine.

6. Controversy:

If the Contract price is based upon measured works, what adjustments should be made to the Contract sum for work omitted, deleted or modified from the Contract's original scope of work despite the AUA's failure and refusal to issue change orders?

Panel's Decision:

The amount of credit to be allowed by the Contractor to the Owner for a deletion or change which results in a decrease in the Contract Sum shall be the actual net cost.

7. Controversy:

If the Contract was based upon measured works, is Leeward entitled to overhead and/or profit for work omitted, deleted or modified from the Contract's original scope of work and if so, what amount is Leeward entitled to for overhead and/or profit on omitted, deleted or modified work?

Panel's Decision:

The amount of credit to be allowed by the Contractor to the Owner for a deletion or change which results in a decrease in the Contract Sum shall be the actual net cost. When both additions and credits covering related work or substitutions are involved in a change, the allowance for overhead and profit shall be figured on the basis of net increase, if any, with respect to that change, i.e., AIA Document A201-1997 General Conditions of the Contract for Construction, Section 7.3.7. Therefore, Leeward is entitled to overhead and profit for work omitted, deleted or modified as claimed, except for the \$185,425.07 of overhead and profit for the Doors & Windows and Flooring works that were deleted from the Contract's original scope of work and then given to Leeward under a Separate Contract.

8. Controversy:

What amount is Leeward entitled to for additions to the Contract that should have been added pursuant to change orders had AUA properly issued change orders on the Project?

Panel's Decision:

This Panel finds that Leeward is entitled to receive compensation for work performed, despite any formal change orders, based on Measured Work and the Bill of Quantities (BOQ).

9. Controversy:

Whether AUA was responsible for project delays that impaired Leeward's ability to substantially complete the Contract work by the substantial completion dates in the Contract, as extended?

Panel's Decision:

After a careful study and analysis of the witness statements as well as the evidence presented, the Panel finds that both parties were equally responsible for the project delays. Leeward failed to reach substantial completion of the project in the time that was agreed upon. The numerous delays and changes to the drawings and the fact that AUA had knowledge of Leeward's request for extension of time, draw us to determine equal responsibility for both parties regarding the delays in the substantial completion.

10. Controversy:

If AUA is responsible for project delays that impaired Leeward's ability to complete the project by the substantial completion dates in the Contract as extended, then what amount is Leeward entitled to for additional preliminaries as a result of the AUA's actions?

Panel's Decision:

This Panel finds that both parties were equally responsible for the project delays. Consequently, we find AUA responsible for 50% of the Additional Preliminaries in the

amount of EO \$477,777.04 and such amount is hereby granted in favor of Leeward.

11. Controversy:

Whether Leeward was responsible for the project delays that caused it to fail to substantially complete the work by the Contract's deadlines?

Panel's Decision:

No. Refer to Panel Decisions in Section VI. (A-9) and (A-10), above.

12. Controversy:

If Leeward is responsible for the project delays that caused it to fail to substantially complete the work by the Contract's deadlines, what amount is due from Leeward to AUA for liquidated damages?

Panel's Decision:

Refer to Panel Decisions in Section VI. (A-9), (A-10) and (B-36), above.

13. Controversy:

Whether Leeward substantially complied with the notice of claim provision in the Contract?

Panel's Decision:

By reason of the conduct of the parties during the development, construction and liquidation of the Project, the Panel concludes that the time limit for the notice of claims stipulated in Section 4.3.2 of the General Conditions was waived, as well as Section 4.6.3 of the General Conditions referring to the initiation of an arbitration process. This decision is applicable to both parties.

14. Controversy:

If Leeward did not substantially comply with the notice of claim provision in the Contract, whether AUA waived compliance with such provision?

Panel's Decision:

See Panel's Decision of Controversy in Section VI. (A-13), above.